

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
NASHVILLE DIVISION

TERRANCE RAINY, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, ) NO. 3:20-00771  
 ) JUDGE RICHARDSON  
 v. )  
 )  
 CORECIVIC, INC, et al., )  
 )  
 Defendants. )

## **ORDER**

Pending before the Court is a Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Doc. No. 21), recommending that Plaintiff's Complaint (Doc. No. 1) be dismissed under Rule 72(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and Local Rule 72.02(a). No Objections to the Report and Recommendation have been filed by Plaintiff.<sup>1</sup>

The failure to object to a report and recommendation releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *Frias v. Frias*, No. 2:18-cv-00076, 2019 WL 549506, at \*2 (M.D. Tenn. Feb. 12, 2019); *Hart v. Bee Property Mgmt.*, No. 18-cv-11851, 2019 WL 1242372, at \*1 (E.D. Mich. March 18, 2019) (citing *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985)). The district court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made. *Ashraf v. Adventist Health System/Sunbelt, Inc.*, 322 F. Supp. 3d 879, 881 (W.D. Tenn. 2018); *Benson v. Walden Security*, No. 3:18-cv-0010, 2018

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff also failed to respond to an order entered May 25, 2021. (Docket No. 20). In that order, Plaintiff was advised that process was returned unexecuted and that a recommendation for the dismissal of the case would be entered unless, no later than June 21, 2021, he provided a new address for service of process upon Defendant Hernandez or showed good cause for why the action should not be dismissed. Plaintiff has not made any response to this order or taken any steps to have Defendant Hernandez served.

WL 6322332, at \*3 (M.D. Tenn. Dec. 4, 2018). The district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and rulings to which no specific objection is filed. *Id.*

Nonetheless, the Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation and the file. The Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 21) is adopted and approved. Accordingly, this action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice, and the Clerk is directed to close the file. This Order shall constitute the final judgment in this case under Fed. R. Civ. P. 58.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Eli Richardson

ELI RICHARDSON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE